

REMARKS

Claims 1-5 and 11-12 are amended herein. No claims have been canceled. Thus, claims 1-15 remain pending.

The specification has also been amended, at paragraph 33, to insert the application number of a related application.

Additionally, claim 11 has been amended to correct a typographical error noticed by Applicant. The scope of claim 11 has not changed.

In regard to the drawings, Applicant has attached formal drawings in compliance with 37 CFR § 1.84 to replace the informal drawings previously filed. The Examiner is respectfully requested to review, approve and enter the seven (7) formal replacement sheets submitted herewith.

The Examiner is further requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejections set forth in the first Office action for the reasons presented below.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1-3, 6, 10, 11 and 15 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Tanaka et al. (U.S. Pat. 5,945,759). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

As amended herein, independent claim 1 recites a dynamoelectric machine comprising, among other things, a stator core, a rotor shaft, and at least one bearing supporting the rotor shaft for rotation, where the first bearing is positioned longitudinally within the stator core. As noted on page 3 of the first Office action, Tanaka fails to show a dynamoelectric machine having at least one bearing positioned longitudinally within a

stator core. Accordingly, Tanaka fails to anticipate amended claim 1 and claim 2, 3, 6 and 10 which depend therefrom.

Independent claim 11 recites a dynamoelectric machine comprising, among other things, a stator core and two endshields defining opposite ends of the machine, at least one of the endshields having a portion which extends to a longitudinal position within the stator core.

Although the first Office action asserts that Fig. 3 of Tanaka shows an endshield having a portion which extends to a longitudinal position within the stator core, this is simply incorrect. Instead, Tanaka shows a stator core 10, a rear casing 7, and a sleeve-like bush 13 fitted into the rear casing 7. See Fig. 3 and column 4, lines 20-25. Even if the rear casing 7 constitutes an endshield, the rear casing clearly does not extend to a longitudinal position within the stator core 10, as required by claim 11. Although Fig. 3 of Tanaka appears to show the bush 13 extending to a longitudinal position within the stator core 10, the bush 13 is clearly not an endshield. Accordingly, Tanaka fails to disclose an endshield that extends to a longitudinal position within a stator core, and therefore fails to anticipate independent claim 11 and claim 15 which depends therefrom.

For these reasons, the Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the § 102(b) rejection of claims 1-3, 6, 10, 11 and 15.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 4, 5, 12 and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tanaka et al. in view of Peter et al. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

In regard to claims 4 and 5, these claims depend from independent claim 1 and are therefore patentable for the same reasons as independent claim 1.

As noted above, independent claim 1 recites a dynamoelectric machine having a stator core, a rotor shaft, and at least one bearing supporting the rotor shaft for rotation, where the first bearing is positioned longitudinally within the stator core. Additionally, amended claim 1 recites the rotor as “positioned within the stator core.” Thus, amended claim 1 recites a dynamoelectric machine having an inner rotor configuration with both the rotor and the at least one bearing positioned longitudinally within the stator core.

As further noted above, Tanaka fails to disclose a machine having a bearing positioned within the stator core. Instead, the Patent Office relies on Peter et al. as disclosing at least one bearing positioned within a stator core. However, the motor disclosed by Peter has an outer rotor configuration. Thus, like Tanaka, Peter fails to disclose or suggest a dynamoelectric machine having an inner rotor configuration with both the rotor and the at least one bearing positioned longitudinally within the stator core, as recited by amended claim 1. Furthermore, whether considered alone or in combination, neither reference contains any motivation or suggestion for modifying the bearing position employed in Tanaka’s inner rotor design with the bearing position employed in Peter’s outer rotor design. Accordingly, the combination of Tanaka and

Peter fails to render obvious amended claim 1 and claims 4 and 5 which depend therefrom.

In regard to claims 12 and 13, these claims depend from independent claim 11 and are therefore patentable for the same reasons as independent claim 11.

As noted above, Tanaka fails to disclose an endshield having a portion which extends to a longitudinal position within a stator core, as recited by independent claim 11. Similarly, Peter fails to disclose or suggest an endshield having a portion which extends to a longitudinal position within a stator core. Accordingly, as neither Tanaka nor Peter disclose or suggest this recited feature of claim 11, they fail to render obvious independent claim 11 and claims 12 and 13 which depend therefrom.

For these reasons, the Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the § 103 rejection of claims 4, 5, 12 and 13.

Claims 7 and 8 stand rejected under § 103 as being unpatentable over Tanaka et al. in view of Matsushita et al. Additionally, claims 9 and 14 stand rejected under § 103 as being unpatentable over Tanaka et al. in view of Adams. However, Matsushita and Adams fail to overcome the shortcomings of Tanaka and Peter noted above.


Specifically, neither Matsushita nor Adams teaches or suggests a dynamoelectric machine having (i) an inner rotor configuration with both a rotor and at least one bearing positioned longitudinally within the stator core, or (ii) an endshield having a portion which extends to a longitudinal position within a stator core. Accordingly, claims 7-9 and 14 are allowable for at least the same reasons as independent claims 1 and 11 from which they depend, respectively.

CONCLUSION

It is believed that all of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all presently outstanding rejections. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action and, as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. Thus, prompt and favorable consideration of this amendment is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at (314) 726-7500.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: 3-18-05

By: 
Michael J. Thomas, Reg. 39,857

HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.
7700 Bonhomme, Suite 400
St. Louis, MO 63105
(314) 726-7500

AMENDMENTS TO THE DRAWINGS

The attached seven (7) "Replacement Sheets" of drawings include Figures 1-9 and replace the original sheets including Figures 1- 9.

Attachment: Replacement Sheets